My name is Christopher Jackson. I am an adjunct faculty member at Housatonic Community College, primarily teaching English composition, and at Quinnipiac University, where I tutor international students in writing and teach two seminars on the Individual in the Community. I have three master's degrees and approximately eleven years of teaching experience in EFL and composition. Last semester I taught at three separate institutions: Housatonic Community College, Southern Connecticut State University, and Quinnipiac University. I'm here to talk to you about the outcome metrics you are considering using for future decisions regarding the allocation of resources; and I also wish to discuss outcomes and consequences of current practices that you will tempted to perpetuate in the name of efficient use of resources, specifically the continued reliance on adjunct faculty and the funding of sports programs.

In passing, I would argue that given the large percentage of adjunct faculty delivering courses at our state institutions, they be given a separate place on the various boards in addition to the places reserved for full time faculty. All faculty are not alike, and our interests are not the same as things stand.

In the proposed legislation, I noticed that among the criteria used to determine the allocation of resources to the various states institutions of higher learning (lines 327-336), graduation rates, student retention rates, and completion rates are explicitly identified.

I would argue that if this state wishes to retain more students to graduation, retention, and completion, at least in the case of students who attend community college (some of whom go on to the state university system), particularly adults, immigrants, low income (and this of course means primarily people of color), then government, both at the state and federal levels, should focus on addressing the complications that make the lives of the poor so hard to manage. I would argue that the driving forces behind low attendance rates, completion rates, and graduation rates lie outside of the classroom and of the institutions of higher learning. My students at Housatonic have to deal with holding down two low-paying jobs, taking care of children or family members, making enough to live on, commute, and to afford school expenses. I believe that those factors count far more than what happens in the classroom in determining attendance and completion rates. By providing affordable day care, government and other potential partners (including employers) could allow low income and middle class mothers and fathers to attend classes with far less difficulty. Head Start and similar programs would enable low income students and even middle income students to actually enter kindergarten an engage in active learning from the start. What percentage of the student population would be affected by this, I cannot say, but the statistics should be easily obtained by institutional research through exit interviews.

Of course, behaviors reinforced and skills neglected in high school are also factors contributing to low completion and graduation rates: poor preparation in basic skills, poor study habits, a woefully inadequate knowledge base to help students get their intellectual bearings in academia, and a sense of disengagement from formal academics come to mind. Greater

cooperation between high schools and colleges might indeed help address some of those concerns. That said, I have observed that when students have to pay relatively large sums for their courses, for instance at CSU, they tend to attend regularly and to complete the courses. Otherwise, and this is particularly the case with community college, they have little to lose by skipping class and ultimately dropping out. I think it right that we should have admission and tuition policies that make it easy for people to attend college and to make it affordable for them; but perhaps requiring them to have more skin in the game tied to attendance and completion might provide more incentives to continue and disincentives to drop out – a rebate system tied to passing grades and completion with some latitude for *force majeure* factors, for these people's lives are complicated.

I suspect that the low graduation and completion rates at the state university are also due to financial reasons and family responsibilities, neither of which can be laid chiefly at the door of the university. I suspect some flexibility, perhaps mixed delivery systems (online and classroom) with longer learning periods or shorter periods than procrustean semesters might help. Perhaps rethinking the scheduling of education might help – adjusting course lengths, for instance, beyond the one-size-fits-all semester model. We all respond to deadlines; but perhaps a different timetable overall might be experimented with. The factory model and the agrarian-driven 9-month schedule are obsolete. We can't afford unused capacity and we don't need to have it. I see no good reason, given the ability to manage demand and the existence of air conditioning, not to have full capacity over the summer as well. Hotels manage their capacity. Colleges, universities, and high schools can too, if they think outside their usual boxes. We now have economic necessity driving innovation.

The most aggressive competition facing public education is for-profit education, and from what I gather, for-profit has taken a great deal of market share away from public education, and in the least price-sensitive segments, namely business and vocational education. That is not to say that public education should abandon its values and walk away from providing the very real although intangible long-term benefits of liberal education. As a liberally educated person who has studied literature, business, and education, I can state categorically from first-hand experience and from observation that liberal arts education, if done properly, produces versatile, articulate, and intellectually nimble people who can make connections that their more literal-minded occupation-focused fellows cannot. I would also argue that these people are more thoughtful and responsible citizens, and richer personal lives as consumers and producers of culture. However, the means of producing those people are messy and indirect, and hence expensive. The link between writing a paper for art history and, for instance, thinking hard about republican civic values can be direct for the individual or the class, but hard to predict or confirm at the institutional level. And yet a more responsible citizen can be the result, which benefits all of us. Good luck measuring those intangibles – they're not captured by graduation rates, retention, completion, or faculty productivity figures. But they do play out in our quality of life, both public and private.

Another potential benefit enjoyed by traditional universities consists of international contacts and experiences, which the for-profits are hard-pressed to provide. In this day and age, I would

advocate a stay abroad for every undergraduate as a goal, and as a requirement for social studies and language teachers as part of their teacher training requirements. There is nothing like an outside perspective for making people aware of what their country offers and what it lacks. And in the meantime, we have the internet and could communicate initially over that, if we made a concerted effort and had the right technology. That could done cheaply at all educational levels. These should not be targeted for cuts but should be identified as priorities.

I taught briefly at Gibbs, a subsidiary of a major player in the booming for-profit education sector, and think that the public education system could learn a few lessons – as much in what to avoid as what to imitate. It took me a while to understand the essentially predatory approach (astute targeting of inner city high school graduates stuck in jobs that require college degrees or technical skills for advancement, aggressive repayment terms, merciless harassment to follow up missed attendance and ensure timely repayment, and lovely graduation and placement statistics since almost all of the students had to hold down jobs to make their payments on time), which of course I am not recommending that our public system emulate. I understand things have changed since I worked there, but clearly the for-profit formula works for many people, particularly with respect to convenience for working adults. One can't argue with enrollment figures, growth rates, and profitability. And of course some of the online schools have no bricks and mortar costs, or ancillary expenses such as sports programs, unlike our state institutions. My own view is that this education is the McDonald's of academe, and I am not being complimentary. But some rigorous competitive analysis might identify some practices that could be adapted. One major competitive advantage that traditional universities enjoy, besides the liberal arts education, is campus community life, which I discuss below. Again, that is a cost factor, difficult to measure, but an essential part of a rich undergraduate and graduate experience. Consider the community life of a commuter school versus a residential community. Consider the difference between elite prep schools, where faculty live on campus and are a presence in student lives, and public schools. Consider effective learning and mentoring relationships. Consider alumni loyalty.

Regarding the subject of effective learning, I have found that my classes with traditional college students leavened with non-traditional students have been more stimulating and thought-provoking for students. For that reason, generally evening classes have been better. I think that high school students would also benefit from classes integrated with adult learners. There is nothing quite like observing an evening class of adults seeking their high school diplomas to drive home the importance of schooling and to model responsible learning. Instead of the punitive detention and expulsion policies I observed in Bridgeport's Central High School, perhaps immersion among motivated adults would be more productive and effective in getting reluctant and unmotivated high school students to smell the coffee and clean up their acts. I think that intermingling – diversity - should be a metric. And of course, the provision of lifelong learning is a means to long-term cash flow for educational institutions. In that connection, short one- or two-day courses on specific topics might be a better way to go than semester-long dribs and drabs courses, especially for working adults and the general public. Then too there are the benefits of revenue-generating potential and the public service value.

Generally, then, I would say that to focus on "outcomes" as you have defined them is to measure the wrong outcomes because they are not the direct result of the activity whose effects you wish to measure. You would first need to identify the root causes of these phenomena. And of course you are looking not at the essential products of the academic activity, which by and large are intangible, qualitative rather than quantitative, and are influenced by factors in and outside of the classroom and on and off the campus. Is graduation necessarily a measure of institutional effectiveness? Is the effectiveness of a library to be measured by the number of books checked out in a year, or is it the number of books actually read?

Now I would like to turn to faculty productivity and the efficient use of financial and other resources. As you undoubtedly know, higher education in this country has come to rely on part-time faculty, particularly for introductory level courses. While this practice is of course less costly in terms of savings on benefits and salaries, and so undoubtedly increases faculty productivity statistics, it does produce negative effects on real student outcomes and on the quality of the student educational experience. **I would argue that where it makes sense from a pedagogical standpoint, particularly for the introductory required courses, adjuncts should be offered full time positions as lecturers at salaries and with benefits that are comparable to those for full time faculty. Long-term (multi-year) renewable contracts, service responsibilities, etc. would be reasonable terms, as long as the salaries are at appropriate levels. I would also argue that a PhD is not necessary for what I do – in some cases, it might actually be counterproductive when it comes to teaching freshman introductory courses. But the current system, with its gross inequities, its inefficiency, and its dysfunctional effects on campus community and the quality of undergraduate education, to say nothing of its effects on the adjunct population, has got to stop.** I hope to suggest why in the following paragraphs.

I realize that some reform is underway at Southern and perhaps at other CSU campuses. However, it's business as usual at Housatonic and presumably at the other community colleges. Here's how the state's capping of the number of courses I can teach at any institution in the CSU system or at any of the Community Colleges in the state systems plays out. If I wish to make a decent middle-class living, I am forced to seek and to take jobs at several institutions, generally a mix of public and private, and geographically separated. Of course, institutional expenses for benefits, professional development, etc., are minimized. However, so are my contributions to the campuses where I teach. If my situation were unique, it would not be worth bringing to your attention. However, when this is the predominant situation, you might want to think a lot harder about outcomes, about what you're actually measuring, and about the kind of educational environment you are perpetuating.

I don't attend department meetings or staff meetings. Usually it's because I would have to go in just for those, and the commute of 50 minutes each way takes too large a block out of my day. Of course, there are no regular staff meetings for part timers precisely because their schedules are unmanageable.

This is the outcome: wild inconsistencies in grading standards (and hence grades) and in assignments from section to section; wild inconsistencies and variations in content from section to section. One consequence for those instructors downstream is trying to build upon previous coursework that did not comply with department standards and objectives. I can't really count on my new students knowing what they are supposed to know, whether they are supposed to have learned it in high school or in college. Another outcome: no collegial interaction. Thus I can't share my innovative or successful ideas or learn from others' experience in the classroom. I'm on my own or have to solicit ideas from the course directors. They're not necessarily there when I teach, so it has to be done by phone or email. I challenge you to tell me how this is beneficial to instruction. I also challenge you to show me where and how this is measured.

I don't follow or attend campus events. I don't take part in campus community activities I often cannot attend since I live so far away and/or am not on campus on those occasions. And of course I can't predict what my schedule will be from semester to semester, so I don't commit to any long-term projects requiring on-campus presence.

This is the outcome: I can't discuss those events with my students or set an example for community involvement. I don't really contribute to the campus community. And of course it is difficult to integrate those with my assignments.

I don't attend any professional development sessions unless I'm paid to attend. Again, the commute is not worth my time, or else I am teaching elsewhere. As far as long-term opportunities go, I might not be teaching at the same institution the following semester, so I can't really apply for trips or seminars for professional development.

This is the outcome: I am responsible for my own professional development. Mind you, this is ultimately a more productive situation than the frequent time-burning professional development dog-an-pony shows at the secondary level. But I have to learn how to use the various resources on my own and on my own time, and so of course I don't – or I learn the minimum. There is also the issue of proprietary information: why should I produce a course from which I will not benefit (as is the case with online courses)? If I were treated more generously, I might not object. As it stands, I will not play.

I don't attend norming sessions to ensure that my grading is consistent with the grading of other instructors in the same courses. Usually this is due to scheduling conflicts. But again, I am not paid to attend, and it's at least four hours out of my day. A non-starter.

This is the outcome: Wild grading inconsistencies from section to section; most probably grade inflation as well, since some of us prefer not to penalize students for being in our sections when other instructors are easy graders. Academic freedom or sloppy management? I'd vote for the second.

I don't mingle socially or casually with other faculty, particularly full-time faculty. I attend the odd semester end or holiday party, but often can't attend other events because I am teaching elsewhere. In any case, I never see these people at other times.

This is the outcome: No discussion of opportunities for collaboration, innovative collaborative interdisciplinary projects, and no development of informal ties to facilitate that. The silo effect is alive and well in academe from high school onwards. Personally, I also feel that I am treated as a second class citizen, not so much personally as institutionally. The box of chocolates in the adjunct cubicle common room doesn't quite make up for all the rest. I appreciate the gesture. But it is a sop.

I hold the minimum number of office hours, always around the times of my courses. I don't stay on any campus longer than I need to.

This is the outcome: Because so many of my students at HCC and SCSU work, holding regular office hours during the day makes no sense. For most of them, office hours are not helpful. So when do they get extra help? They don't. Or they go to the peer tutoring center for academic support – not quite the same level of quality as professional tutors. But it sure looks good on the bottom line. Unfortunately for them, it's hard to quantify the ability to write an essay or to think, but savings on academic support salaries – those we can quantify. You are measuring the wrong outcomes.

I travel about 500 miles a week on Connecticut highways, spending around 8 hours a week commuting – sometimes going back and forth between campuses when courses are not scheduled back-to-back.

This is the outcome: I do generate gasoline tax revenue, but I am one more single occupant driver on 95 and the Merritt. I spew out emissions for all of us to breathe just to get my body across the state because God forbid I should work at the CSU campus nearest to me. And of course this also plays out in my reluctance or inability to attend campus events. And of course I figure that commuting time into how many hours I am willing and able to allocate to a given course. So I make sure that my loss in productivity plays out in an overall loss of productivity that your statistics do not capture specifically. I have less time to correct, less time to prepare, and so on. Those factors can affect the quality of the classroom experience. I haven't mentioned fatigue or stress. Generally, however, adrenalin kicks in when I enter the classroom.

I don't prepare for my courses until I have the contracts in my hand. I have had several courses cancelled and will not prepare until the course commitments are firm.

This is the outcome: I often have little time to prepare my new courses, order my books (which in any case would not arrive in time for the beginning of the semester). It is true that once I am in the pool of chronic adjuncts, I am offered courses I have taught before. But all too many are offered at the last minute and guess what? Managing that process is the way

in which course coordinator time is spent. That will contribute a lot to university research and the advancement of learning - as faculty productivity is measured. And by the way, some of them are still doing it using Word (instead of an online scheduling system). Did someone mention faculty productivity? And of course they should have PhDs, because every PhD learns how to send emails and schedule adjuncts in graduate school. I recognize that scheduling has to be done by someone – but consider how much time and effort are spent on that rather than on advising and supporting the faculty teaching those courses. Which is more likely to generate positive outcomes?

I am often assigned courses at the very last minute, including the same day that classes start.

This is the outcome: Because I am experienced, it is not as big a problem as one might think; but for new courses, it is disastrous. I have to seek out work at as many institutions as I can because I take the first courses offered. If I have to master new texts, it will take me half a semester to get ahead of the curve, and the quality of instruction suffers as a result. This has happened again and again. Faculty and administrators seem chronically incapable of managing demand and smoothing the load. You would think that the system should be able to function at full capacity. Perhaps I don't understand how courses are offered and how enrollment works. Perhaps college management could use some re-engineering to maximize the productivity of all resources. Is it so hard to schedule introductory classes across a school year including the previous summer and following summer?

I've given up trying to send emails to full timers at SCSU, generally because they don't respond. They are not the only ones.
The old email system at SCSU is a nightmare – memory is too small and people's inboxes are full. Generally the CT system email is not great – three separate logins – who does that? I had to create a word file with the list of my students so I could send out emails to my HCC classes because Blackboard can't generate a class emailing list. Is anyone measuring that kind of inefficiency? Well, no, because it's burning my time. I understand that a new system has been introduced at Southern. Good. But the old one has been a drag on my productivity and effectiveness.

This is the outcome: poor communication with students and colleagues. Certainly communication is not timely. I ended up opening up a gmail account for my SCSU classes. One login. Works fine.

My teaching load is limited primarily so that the state does not have to pay me benefits (which, thanks to my wife's private sector job coverage, I don't actually need). I acknowledge that the optimal course load for my discipline, English, is around four courses per semester, but that would generate at most around $32K a year with long gaps between paychecks in the summer, from Mid-May through late September. (Adjuncts are generally cut loose in the summer time, priority for courses going to full-time faculty or those with seniority on the adjunct list, some having been adjuncts for fifteen years or more). So I end up taking on six courses or the

equivalent in tutoring time, and I know of colleagues who take on as many as seven courses (though admittedly not all in English).

This is the outcome: I teach at two, three, and on occasion four institutions, with varying standards, course objectives, student populations, etc. The different student populations have different needs, and present different levels of skill. I cannot focus on developing the techniques needed for one population. This has made me a better teacher, but it makes me more inefficient: I have to teach three different courses, even if the content and objectives are fairly similar. Another irony there is when I teach a composition course at Housatonic and essentially the same course at SCSU, transfer students have to take their composition courses over again. That credit compatibility from community college to CSU is one issue that should be addressed. But the essential outcome is that I don't have the time to dedicate to each of my students, especially in writing classes. This is a problem specific to English, because students learn primarily through writing: but you should know: when too many corners are cut, the learning outcomes will suffer, and they will not show up in your statistics since they are qualitative in nature. Faculty downstream (full-time faculty, often in other disciplines, focused on content) will note that the students have not mastered grammar, or organization, or argumentation, or proper citation, and will either penalize the students in the form of lower grades, or remand them to tutoring, which may or may not help (but will create demand for additional resources, growing support empires to provide remediation for problems that should have been resolved earlier on).

I have to start looking for employment for the next semester at the beginning of every semester.

This is the outcome: students don't get their papers back as soon as they could, or are assigned fewer assignments because I don't have the time to correct them. My priority is ensuring my future cash flow – we all have to pay attention to the bottom line, don't we?

Times of crisis present opportunities to drive change. I am here to tell you that **the present system of relying on adjuncts to the extent you do is counter-productive – it may be penny-wise, but it is certainly pound-foolish in qualitative terms**, as I hope I have shown. But I know that this is like trying to get a crack whore off crack. The union represents the interests of full-time faculty and does little for our interests. It skims off our dues either way and thus is not accountable. The state is the employer, and it's saving money as things stand, so it has no incentive to change. However, the higher educational system is not doing so well in terms of results, is it? Not that the secondary educational system is performing all that well, either, as any teacher of college freshmen can attest. But our focus in this discussion is primarily the college level.

If I had the time, I would agitate to start another union for adjuncts only or start a nationwide company consisting of adjuncts that would give both of you cause for concern. But I have a family to feed and a mortgage to pay, and I am a teacher, not a union organizer.

You should consider that the incentives in this system all run in the wrong direction:

I note that the incentive operating on me in the classroom is to winnow out – the fewer the students, the less work for me and the more productive we can be as a group. Get rid of the dead weight early on. I'm not saying that is how I respond, but that is what is actually rewarded. And if we have learned nothing from the recent Wall Street debacle, at least I hope we have learned to follow the money. I try to prepare all of my students to succeed in college and beyond, but I do that in spite of the incentive structure.

I like the work that I do – after all, I have chosen it. My primary loyalty is to my students, but I am profoundly indifferent, if not hostile, to the institutions. How could I not be? The opportunities offered in other working environments – decent pay, meaningful benefits, prospects for professional development, prospects for advancement, collegiality and collaborative projects, and the sense of working with others for a common goal – all these are lacking. Like other adjuncts, I close my eyes to the conditions for the sake of the immensely psychically rewarding work of teaching.

To sum up: Many of the things that tend to make an academic community thrive are actually discouraged by the adjunct system: mentoring, collegial collaboration, coordination, on-campus presence, informal contacts, information-sharing, support of and participation in campus activities, opportunities for professional development and advancement within the institution. I return, my commitment to any given institution lasts as long as I am paid – and I am not the party that established the nature and tenor of that relationship. Do not for a second imagine that that relationship does not affect the quality of the undergraduate experience. Just because you don't measure it, do not imagine that it doesn't exist.

So the question is, where can and where should cuts be made, if cuts there must be?

I have found generally that students are woefully ignorant of current affairs, general culture, US history, and the basics of grammar and punctuation. Responsibility for that failure rests with our secondary education establishment, and I can safely say that the suburban schools are not much better than the urban ones in that regard. Some of these students are very, very far behind. In my view, the need for remedial ("developmental") structures at the CSU level is due to poor performance at the secondary level. If those problems are fixed, we would not need some of the support systems in place at the college level to bring students up to speed. Perhaps those support systems should be provided by the community college system. Long term, the state university system should not be funding programs that are supposed to fix problems that should be addressed earlier on. Drive accountability where it belongs. Don't accept students to the CSU system who can't meet higher standards. Make it possible for them to attain them, but not within the CSU system.

And this brings us to another elephant in the room in American higher education. Given the core mission of university education, can anyone tell me how the sports programs contribute to academic education, professional skills acquisition, or intellectual development? I understand

that there are multiple career opportunities and professions within the sports sector. I understand that there are different kinds of intelligence. But other than providing exercise, a focus for community identity, and outlets for adolescent energy, I fail to see the justification for the level of emphasis placed on sports by higher education in this country. After all, other countries don't. Perhaps ticket revenues; perhaps reasons for scholarships and showcases for the physical talents of students who otherwise might not be able to attend college; but how important are these to the core mission of the university? Americans love sports; but is the university the place to indulge that interest? This might be a non-starter or a political hot potato. But if you're talking about underpaying adjuncts, who actually teach and contribute to what the university exists for, versus funding basketball courts or playing fields or equipment, which are clearly secondary or tertiary, then the question is worth raising, at least from our perspective. When you're contemplating laying off or not hiring faculty, or discontinuing programs, then a conversation about priorities is necessary. From a marketing perspective, clearly a college with a team is more attractive to prospective athletes than one that is not; but we are living in times of tight budgets and must focus on the essential priorities.

I've run out of time and have to correct papers. If you wish to reach me, or have any questions, my home email is ccetal@netzero.com.